

The Lindon City Council and Lindon City Planning Commission held a Joint Work Session on **Tuesday, December 9, 2014 at 6:00 p.m.** in the Lindon City Center, City Council Chambers, 100 North State Street, Lindon, Utah.

WORK SESSION – 6:00 P.M.

Conducting: Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director

PRESENT

Jeff Acerson, Mayor
Randi Powell, Councilmember
Matt Bean, Councilmember
Van Broderick, Councilmember
Carolyn Lundberg, Councilmember
Sharon Call, Chairperson
Mike Marchbanks, Commissioner
Rob Kallas, Commissioner – arrived 7:04
Bob Wily, Commissioner
Matt McDonald, Commissioner

ABSENT

Jacob Hoyt, Councilmember
Andrew Skinner, Commissioner

Staff Present

Adam Cowie, City Administrator
Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director
Jordan Cullimore, Associate Planner
Don Peterson, Public Works Director
Mark Christensen, City Engineer
Kathy Moosman, City Recorder

Ivory Development Representatives

Chris Gamvroulas
Kyle Honeycutt
Tim Soffe

1. **Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.
2. **Discussion Item:** Lindon City Council and Planning Commission will conduct a joint work session with Ivory Development to discuss a residential housing concept plan on property located at approximately 500 North and 1400 West, otherwise known as the Anderson Farm.

Mayor Acerson invited Mr. Ron Anderson forward at this time. He acknowledged Mr. Anderson's many years of service on the Planning Commission. Mayor Acerson then presented Mr. Anderson with a plaque in honor of his service on the Planning Commission and to Lindon City and its residents.

Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director, opened the discussion by stating the Lindon City Council and Planning Commission are meeting tonight with Ivory Development to discuss a residential housing concept plan on property located at approximately 500 North and 1400 West, otherwise known as the Anderson Farm. He then presented the latest concept plan received from Ivory today. He noted the hope is tonight to have Ivory walk the group through the latest layout and explain the thought process behind where things are located etc. He explained that after the presentation they will take approximately 20 minutes to discuss amongst themselves and to provide an opportunity to bounce ideas between each other. He added if there are any questions or concerns on the big picture items (commercial corridor encroachment, apartment density, open space) to please bring it up while the Ivory Representatives are here to answer any questions. At this time he then turned the time over to the Ivory Representatives to give their presentation.

Tim Soffe, with Think Architecture, addressed the group at this time. Mr. Soffe referenced the concept map on the screen showing the commercial corridor property that is not under contract with Ivory and still owned by the Andersons. He noted the existing development is the 55 and older community and referenced the Thorne property that is not a part of the ownership as well. He mentioned one thing they look at as planners are the edges and there are couple of edges that concern them. The freeway corridor that has a lot of noise and a lot of activity which says to them, as planners, that there is influence generated from the activity on the freeway but also on the industrial edge. He pointed out that you need to be careful what you put there, which is probably not the best high value residential neighbor there is. Also a commercial edge is established so you need to find the appropriate buffer. These are the things they looked at when approaching this project.

Mr. Soffe stated he would also like to educate the Council and Commission on principles of a walkable community that will enhance the values along with future land uses as well. If they can plan into the community the ability to walk from place to place and make it pleasant to walk to another area we can reduce auto traffic but also enhance the value of the property just by being able to walk to green places such as parks. They also talked about a park program that could be linked by a road system and a well-articulated serpentine walkway to enhance walkways and link one park to another. He noted if a transit station does come at a future date the ability to walk to the transit station would be invaluable. Looking into the future to walkable parks and a future trax station will be part of the enhancement of the community.

Mr. Soffe also mentioned their concerns of trying to put a multifamily element to get the single family away from the noise and intensity of the freeway and also away from the edges. The park will help to get away from the edges and these issues influence the multifamily areas. Mr. Soffe then explained the positioning of the large and small lots and referenced the Ivory catalog and product line to see what houses go on what property. He noted they have spoken with the Alpine School District and LDS Church which will be ongoing discussions as we go through this process. He then asked for feedback from the group to discuss the planning concepts.

Councilmember Bean mentioned that it has been 7 weeks since they last met and questioned what the biggest changes are from then to now. Mr. Soffe stated it was not lotted or showed size of lots, number of lots and where they were going to go, it was

more a bubble plan as he recalls. He noted this plan represents and is posed for the purpose of soliciting the thoughts of the Council and Commission.

Mr. Van Wagenen added that the biggest change since the last meeting is that the 500 ft. commercial zone. What was presented before was the larger piece all commercial with no housing and the park was displayed a little more prevalent. He also noted that the park has moved from another area with the 3 parks being on one side. The Thorne property is still under contract with the hope that perhaps a school can share an area of the park; those are more or less the biggest changes outside of the interior road layouts and the lotting and the relocation of the park. What is being presented now is the townhome product. Mr. Soffe pointed out one thing planners are always faced with is what is today and what is tomorrow (in terms of what is under contract and what is not). That is the way they have to approach this because they don't know right now.

Councilmember Lundberg questioned the high density on the 2 parcels and how many doors per acre it will include. Mr. Soffe stated it will average 35 doors per acre. Councilmember Bean asked if what was formerly proposed along 700 north is not under contract. Mr. Soffe confirmed that statement. He added that they are dealing with the plan they have today and is what the plan represents.

Mr. Gamvroulas stated at the last meeting they were just here to present some ideas and colors; this is version 5 and they will be on version 20 when all is said and done. Mr. Soffe stated they are just making broad assumptions at this point. He also talked about the reasoning for moving the park because they can use the park as part of the connection and as a buffer from the freeway which seems logical. They are trying to increase the value and to make the property and project sustainable in the future.

Councilmember Lundberg expressed her opinion that she likes the u-shaped road that offers more opportunity for a greater variety of commercial users and creates a buffer. She also likes the potential of Class A office space. Mr. Soffe stated that he has learned to patient over time because as much as we desire this to happen everything is market driven and a big element of it is not controlled. Councilmember Lundberg brought up that Ivory does have a commercial arm and that could be an element that is not eliminated, but she is not sure how the market would support that.

Mr. Gamvroulas pointed out that the Andersons have to be willing to sell the property for commercial and they can't predict what the land owner will and won't do with their property at any given time. Mr. Gamvroulas stated it is also too deep and the other problems are that the road is the buffer and it is simply not viable. They don't control the commercial but they do have a commercial arm and it will still be market driven and the big boxes will not locate there; there are other available better spots for a big box because of the location. At this time Mr. Van Wagenen directed the group to take 20 minutes to talk amongst themselves and then they will regroup.

Following group discussion Mr. Van Wagenen asked the group to touch on the highlights of the discussion as follows:

Councilmember Broderick commented that he feels the lot sizes are too small and the density is too high overall, however he does like the parks. Chairperson Call said she would like to see a feathering approach and she would also like to see not lower than 10,000 sq. foot lots. As a group they feel the transition is uncomfortable and there could be better uses.

Mr. Cowie mentioned that the Fieldstone Development homes are an average of 10,000 sq. ft. with some as low as 8,000 sq. ft. and a few up to 12,000 ft. Mr. Gamvroulas stated their goal is to be the same as Fieldstone in size and noted they plan to use a feathering approach.

Mr. Van Wagenen asked if the concerns are about the total number of units or the lot size. Following discussion Mr. Van Wagenen summarized that he is hearing the park is good with the lot size no less than 8,000 but an average of 10,000 with the apartments being transitioned. Mr. Gamvroulas pointed out that rooftops will support a possible trax station and you have to have the rooftops to have viable commercial.

Commissioner Marchbanks commented that he hears the group concurs (in general) that the depth of the commercial area as 500 ft. and agrees that big boxes will be hard to attract there. Councilmember Bean asked the representatives to explain how the higher density issue could be mitigated. Mr. Honeycutt then explained the different ways to do multifamily units including variations of heights (they would prefer to be taller with more units that way – 3 stories) and if the desire is that the overall acreage could come down in order to have more height. If the group wants to take the number down from 400 they would prefer to take the acreage in and keep the height the same so they would have that configuration that brings more of a “Class A” apartment. He would also suggest a tour of their other projects for the group to see them firsthand.

Councilmember Bean expressed his concerns about the high density piece off of Geneva Road where there may be a trax connection in the future. He asked if there is any way to know if that is a future possibility or just a pipe dream. It would be easier for him to feel good about high density there if he had an idea about that. Mr. Cowie stated that is so far out on the long range plan that it is difficult to predict. He did say they have purchased the rail corridor but it could be 20+ years out. There was then some general discussion regarding the possibility of a trax station at that location.

Councilmember Powell commented on the 35 units per acre on the map. She noted we don’t know what is coming with the commercial (although we will try to shape that), but as you build out she sees the area as a potential of mixed use (with a Riverwood’s flavor) and she can see that may pose an opportunity to have a little commercial that will service the residents in some fashion. Mr. Gamvroulas stated they have studied this issue nationally and they look great but the turnover in the commercial is very high and it is a challenge and something they would not want a lot of.

Councilmember Lundberg commented that she would like to keep the commercial strip open as to keep some options open. She is comfortable with the density similar to Fieldstone but would want a better architectural design to attract a high quality resident for the long term. Mr. Honeycutt referenced their catalog noting they will build a nice, high quality product. Councilmember Lundberg noted she would also like to see the price point range before upgrades. She likes the gathering place with the club house and agrees that Ivory makes a quality and better looking product. Mr. Van Wagenen stated one of the reasons the city is entertaining anything different than the standard price point range is product availability for those who have been priced out of Lindon; the question is to find where the balance is. There was then some discussion on street widths and setbacks. Mr. Van Wagenen stated they will be having further discussion on these issues. Mr. Gamvroulas commented at the end of the day they are offering different things to

different people and they will choose what is right for them; the demographics are changing.

Mr. Cowie summarized that he is hearing the group is comfortable with the residential as a concept and in general they are comfortable with something other than single family homes; to have a mixture. The group confirmed those statements. Councilmember Broderick made it clear he would like to see the maximums and minimums defined and noted he does not like a 5 ft. side setback. Councilmember Powell stated she would like to have further discussion on street widths. Mr. Van Wagenen stated they will be having a super Development Review Committee (DRC) meeting. He advised the group as things come up when reviewing the plan to contact himself or Mr. Honeycutt with any questions or concerns.

Mayor Acerson called for any further comments or discussion from the Council or Commission. Hearing none he adjourned the meeting.

Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Approved – December 15, 2015

Kathryn Moosman, City Recorder

Jeff Acerson, Mayor

Sharon Call, Chairperson